



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/942,818	08/29/2001	Olivier Guiter	PALM-3693	8438
49637 7590 01/09/2007 BERRY & ASSOCIATES P.C. 9255 SUNSET BOULEVARD SUITE 810 LOS ANGELES, CA 90069			EXAMINER BECK, ALEXANDER S	
			ART UNIT 2629	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 01/09/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.

09/942,818

Applicant(s)

GUITER ET AL.

Examiner

Alexander S. Beck

Art Unit

2629

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 20 December 2006 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
7. ☐ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:
Claim(s) allowed: _____.
Claim(s) objected to: _____.
Claim(s) rejected: _____.
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
See Continuation Sheet.
12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). _____.
13. ☒ Other: See Continuation Sheet.


SUMATI LEFKOWITZ
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

Continuation of 11.

Applicant asserts that by a preponderance of the evidence one of skill in the art would not have sufficient motivation to combine 3Com® with Derocher, in that the teachings of 3Com® require a stylus for interaction with a touch surface whereas Derocher teaches finger interaction (and not stylus).

After careful consideration of Applicant's arguments, Examiner respectfully disagrees.

Derocher discloses a touch pad for a computing device, such as a hand-held computing device or similar computing resource (Derocher: col. 1, ln. 8-11; col. 2, ln. 32-34), wherein the touch pad presents the appearance and performs the functions of user-definable or "soft" keys (Derocher: col. 7, ln. 1-5).

While the examples throughout the reference detail and illustrate the presence of a user's finger to actuate a position on the touch pad, these teachings are merely exemplary and not limiting.

As one of ordinary skill in the art would ascertain from Derocher, a touch pad is disclosed with a light-emitting layer so as to actively illuminate the touch pad surface.

Derocher discloses expressly wherein the touch sensor of the touch pad incorporates capacitive or resistive surfaces to identify the location of contact on the touch pad surface (Derocher: col. 2, ln. 65 – col. 3, ln. 23).

Thus, the actuation of the touch surface is not limited to a finger given that capacitive and resistive touch pad technologies are capable of interacting with a plurality of input devices, including a stylus.

Moreover, the "hand-held computing device" of Derocher has a "touch pad which is used as a graphical input device that conveys user inputs which control the operations of the computing device" (Derocher: col. 1, ln. 8-11), and is therefore inclusive of the teachings of 3Com® which utilizes a stylus (e.g. user inputs) to control the operations of a hand-held computing device.

As such, it is the Examiner's position that by a preponderance of the evidence one of ordinary skill in the art would have sufficient motivation to combine 3Com® with Derocher, in that the teachings of 3Com® and Derocher are related to sensors of a touch surface that detect actuation by a stylus.

Continuation of 13. Other: An initialized copy of the Information Disclosure Statement filed 20 December 2006 is attached.

asb
1/4/07